

Dear Friends and Guests!

First of all, I must thank our dear guest Kati Kondor for taking on the role of coordinator for the umpteenth time, in addition to her kind but sincere comments. With the greatest respect, I welcome Mr Alain Terrenoire, President of Paneurope International, and Mr Henri Malosse, who have kindly come to Budapest from distant French cities to share their valuable thoughts with us.

I also welcome our friend Mr. Samu Csinta from Sepsiszentgyörgy, who also came from very far away, and Prof. Margit Batthyány-Schmidt, Viktória Németh, László Földi, and Prof. György Nógrádi, who came from closer to home, but whose thoughts also help us to find our way in the world. Unfortunately, Tamás Fritz fell ill two days ago and cannot be with us. We wish him a speedy recovery.

When I put out a call to our members a month ago asking them to participate in the conference, the president of the Sárvár organisation sent a short and somewhat sceptical message, which I would like to read here:

Dear Mr. President,

Thank you for the invitation but I think I'd better not go. You know my position on the subject - I support a confederation of strong and equal nation states. Brussels' current position is the opposite, and the submissive majority is on their side. A few strong European states will be in the background with the globalist multi-corporations and the ultra-liberal world gendarme USA. Asking for our opinion is just dusting, a pseudo-democracy - their position will prevail. Nevertheless, I wish you all a fruitful debate, please stand up for the Hungarian position.

On behalf of myself and the Sárvár organisation, I wish you a Merry Christmas, good health and a Happy New Year. (*Mr. President Dr. Gábor Illés*)

I must confess that I do not feel the scepticism of the President of the Sárvár organisation to be unfounded either, but I think that we still need to do everything possible to ensure that the principles on the basis of which Hungary entered the EU in 2004 are upheld.

I must start by saying that the Hungarian Pan-European Union was not formed by chance, and Hungary did not enter the EU by chance. We still consider this an important achievement even today. We are seeking answers to the burning questions about the future of the Union - and that is why we have gathered here today - precisely

to help the larger countries and any dissenting politicians to understand what is unacceptable to us, because what the Brussels leadership wants to implement goes against our culture, our traditions and our moral values. And we want the European Union to have a long life with Hungary's active participation!

When the Hungarian Pan-European Union was founded, Otto Habsburg convinced many Hungarian citizens of the importance of joining the Union, of taking back the control of our country from distant Moscow - taking it into our own hands - and choosing a Union where all nations ~~would~~ have the opportunity to assert their interests with equal partners.

That is what we believe and hope for even today.

But how much has the European Union changed since we joined and what do we expect from it?

Since 1990, since the formation of the Antall government, we have known that when Hungary elects a right-wing government, our country will be the target of the press of all European countries that have left-wing governments. So, it has become clear that sovereignty is already being violated when our country is attacked for no good reason, for political conviction and let us admit it, for economic interests. Because the right-wing leadership has one unpleasant characteristic; it does not ~~usually~~ allow its country to be treated as a pauper. Our Western partners in the Kádár-era with left-wing leadership, got used to a convenient emulation by Hungary.

All this has been topped off by two important elements in recent times; the push for migration and the parallel attempt to loosen the social pull points, the moral, religious and cultural loosening under the banner of the 'open society'.

But what is an open society in terms of the means used to achieve it politically and the impact on our society?

We have to decide whether we want a strong Europe or a WORLD torn to atoms!

Because let's face it, the other nations of the world (Russians, Chinese, Turks, etc.) are doing their business "non-nuclear", while the backing power wants to re-educate us through of Brussels.

A positive characteristic of the majority of the German people is that they want to live for a cause, they want to be enthusiastic and do something. They may see the failure and the serious loss of prestige of the Second World War and abandoning their German consciousness they try to replace it with a desire to do something for Europe. However, this desire to do can easily turn into dictates, as this is also a feature of the German consciousness.

At the same time, it is important for Europe how 60-80 million people in one of its key countries think. It was perhaps the reason that a competition was launched around 1960 in Germany under the title "Was tust Du für Europa?"

I am convinced that one can only live for Europe and for the world in part. Up to a point, of course, because there are many common interests, but at a certain point you have to decide; what am I, a European or a citizen of the world?

An artist can be a citizen of the world because a painted sunset or a piano race means the same to a Filipino as it does to a European, but a factory worker or a farmer who has to and wants to live by local rules, local climate and especially local customs will never be a citizen of the world. That is why we cannot exchange our identity, our European existence, for the song of the muezzins.

We swear and die in churches.

Some who advocate 'more union', or federation, have hoped that the pandemic would bring the members of the Union closer together, but they were wrong. Once again it has turned out that local decision making (if in the right hands, of course) can do more than an administrator pulling for no one, perhaps a political grouping. National governments are accountable to their own people, not like Brussels bureaucrats.

Otto von Habsburg's oft-quoted phrase: "the further the decision-making is from the people concerned, the more freedom is infringed" has been confirmed.

Mr President Berndt Posselt has repeatedly sounded the warning bell against 'national egoism'. This is indeed a key issue for Europe. However, this legitimate expectation has a different meaning in the case of a great power or in the case of a small country such as Hungary. If a powerful country lacks the willingness to exercise self-restraint, it harms the community of the Union. At the same time, if a small country does not make an effort to defend its own interests, the values that are its national characteristics or its economic interests can be damaged or even destroyed in a matter of moments. We therefore support the fight against national egoism, but at the same time we stress

that this does not apply to small countries, which must have the right to defend their interests.

Today, the European Union has reached a turning point for its future. We do agree with this statement. Not because of the question Brussels itself has put to the European citizens, but because we see that the Brussels leadership has moved the goalposts, all the important issues are moved to a direction that aim to avoid the national competences which were fixed at the time of entry.

For example, the issue of energy management, which is clearly a national competence, but which is nevertheless being twisted to slip into the realm of environmental protection. Some circles believe that this could override national competence. But this also includes the issue of migration. Whoever a country admits to enter her border is also a national competence, but if every person who enters illegally is characterised as a refugee, then it can immediately become a humanitarian issue.

Let alone child protection, it is simply inexplicable why this self-evident issue, which is entirely a national competence, which protects the natural state and the rights of parents, can be turned into a matter.

We firmly reject these attempts to divert powers.

More meaty issues that the Hungarian left is fond of promising;

1) The unified European minimum wage.

The Hungarian Pan-European Union has already stated in its resolutions on several occasions that this is not only unfeasible at European level, but merely a good-sounding nonsense. At least from a Hungarian point of view. If I look at the domestic situation only, the consequences of a single (presumably higher) minimum wage would be as follows:

- it would fix a significant item of the budget, so the free margins of the national budget would shrink, leaving less for health, education, infrastructure development.
- a single minimum wage would push other wages higher without a commensurate economic performance, thus leading to a loss of competitiveness and deterioration of the Hungarian economy
- companies that have relocated to Hungary because of the better wages would immediately pick up their tents - putting hundreds of thousands of Hungarian

workers out of their jobs (South Korea alone has more than 100,000 workers in its factories here).

2) If the European Public Prosecutor's Office is accepted as a supreme body, the Hungarian judiciary would be rendered vulnerable; the left-wing politicians in Brussels will seize every opportunity to bleed Hungary dry, even at this stage. The EU Prosecutor's Office would be another tool in the hands of those who have a vested interest; at any time they could pin corruption charges on anyone the situation of which is no worse in Hungary than in other Member States.

*Issues on the horizon which we are committed to:*

3) The introduction of a single currency

This will only be justified if the Hungarian economy's competitiveness is at least equal to the euro area on average. For it is clear that while the variable exchange rate of the Forint allows the interests of the economy to be asserted, the exchange rate of the Euro dictated by the strong economy would - if introduced - severely impair the competitiveness of the Hungarian economy (see the continuous indebtedness of the southern member states towards the countries with strong economies).

4) Migration is a daily issue: in Europe today. Migration advocates argue that labour is needed, but this is not true, because the average unemployment rate in the Eurozone is just twice that of Hungary. It is true that there are areas where the indigenous population is reluctant to work, but this is hardly replaced by newcomers because integration is difficult, while at the same time the continuous development of robots can be used to increase production - with fewer people. - But let's look at the numbers: In Germany in 2016(!), 22.5% of the 82.5 million population had a migrant background, i.e. 18,6 million people. This proportion has now risen to around 51%. But the influx of migrants looking for a new home is not so keen to work; they prefer to take welfare - so perhaps they are more like consumers for the multinationals. Only 18% of those with refugee status were in work, also according to 2017 data. Taking all this into account, we can say that immigration is rather a tool to eliminate national, European identity, family, etc., which breaks up the 1000-year-old fabric of society.

*all in the meantime:*

- the role of the family, the values of the Christian conservative conception are devalued and discredited in every possible way in the media, in feature films, in news reports.

- It is clear that they are not trying to solve the problem of depopulation by strengthening the family. The aim of migration is - spoken or unspoken - to reach a new population that is not linked to the nations, and that is easy prey on the labour market, culture and social organisation without traditions and ties.

5) In the light of the growing signs of LGBTQ, we consider the Child Protection Act passed by the Hungarian Parliament to be right and we support it without wishing to interfere in the private life of any individual or to impose their identity or gender identity. With this in mind, we condemn all malicious sentiments that challenge this law.

6) Concerning civil movements, we reject any movement or foundation in Hungary that appears to be a civil movement - and that is involved in the political struggles in Hungary - and that is supported by other countries and it hides this fact from public opinion.

- If they are already proclaiming an open society!

There are many who see an effective and strong Union in an even closer federal Europe, but there are also many who want a "Europe of strong nations", i.e. confederal cooperation.

One more very important question:

In order to increase the international weight of the European Union, we consider it possible and with, in further consultation, an agreement between the Member States we urge on a better coordination of common foreign policy, secret services and defence, possibly as a sub-group of NATO, as we envisage.

Having considered all of this, the Hungarian Pan-European Union advocates and supports the survival of a united, sovereign Europe of Nations, on the basis of the enforcement and the strict compliance with the treaties at the time of our accession to the EU..

- We demand that the leadership of the European Union should stop the ideological war against Hungary and its elected leadership!

- Finally, we caution the European Union's speakers and media to refrain from blatant interference in the Hungarian elections - because it seems that the withholding of the recovery fund, which Hungary voted for and also committed to repay, according to

Paolo Gientiloni's admission, was already imposed as a pretext for the (deliberately misinterpreted) Child Protection Act. This is clearly an intervention with economic means in the interests of left-liberal politics.

Thank you for listening